

- 11 -

**REMARKS**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-51 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Uszok et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0205772). Applicant respectfully disagrees with such rejection, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove to each of the independent claims.

With respect to each of the independent claims, the Examiner has relied on paragraph [0057], lines 8-15 from Uszok to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "if said target process is available to said target computer to pass at least a portion of said operation specifying data from said agent process to said target process" (see the same or similar, but not identical language in each of the independent claims).

Applicant notes that such excerpt merely teaches downloading an sBot class which is initialized by a message from a botMaster so that it can carry out a task requested by a user. Applicant respectfully asserts that downloading a class utilized for carrying out a task requested by a user, as in Uszok, does not meet applicant's specific claim language, since applicant claims passing "at least a portion of said operation specifying data from said agent process to said target process" where the agent process and the target process execute on the target computer and the target process is independent of the agent process (see remaining claim language in independent claims).

Also with respect to each of the independent claims, the Examiner has relied on paragraph [0054], lines 13-15 from Uszok to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "target process code operable to provide one or more target processes for performing operations in response to operation specifying data, said one or more target processes being provided at said first computer independently of said agent process" (see the same or similar, but not identical language in each of the independent claims).

Applicant has amended such claim language for clarification as follows:

- 12 -

“target process code operable to provide one or more target processes for performing operations in response to operation specifying data, said one or more target processes being provided at said ~~first~~target computer independently of said agent process.”

In view of the above clarification, applicant respectfully asserts that the excerpt relied on by the Examiner does not meet applicant's specific claim language since such excerpt simply discloses that “[e]ach portion of the bot, mBot and sBot, is implemented as a separate executable program designed to communication and interact with its counterpart.” Applicant emphasizes that Uszok further teaches that the “mBot portion executes exclusively on the end user's (client) machine, while the corresponding sBot portion executes on a server platform.” Thus, since Uszok teaches executable programs where each is located on different machines, applicant asserts that such excerpt cannot meet applicant's claimed “said one or more target processes being provided at said target computer independently of said agent process,” since applicant claims that the agent process also executes on the target computer (emphasis added), as claimed.

The Examiner is reminded that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.* 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

This criterion has simply not been met by the Uszok reference, as noted above. Nevertheless, despite such paramount deficiencies and in the spirit of expediting the prosecution of the present application, applicant has substantially incorporated the subject matter of Claims 5-8 et al. into each of the independent claims.

- 13 -

With respect to the subject matter of Claim 5 et al., presently incorporated into each of the independent claims, the Examiner has relied on paragraph [0061], lines 3-10 from Uszok to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed technique "wherein said operation performed includes configuring said target computer to execute a computer program." Applicant respectfully asserts that such excerpt simply teaches configuring and executing a bot, and not "configuring said target computer to execute a computer program," as claimed by applicant (emphasis added).

With respect to the subject matter of Claim 6 et al., presently incorporated into each of the independent claims, the Examiner has relied on paragraph [0064], lines 5-11 from Uszok to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed technique "wherein said target process is operable to map configuration data specified within said operation specifying data to a configuration data store of said target computer." Applicant respectfully asserts that such excerpt merely teaches "user setup data...[that] is stored." Clearly, storing user setup data, as in Uszok, does not meet applicant's claimed "configuration data specified within said operation specifying data." In addition, such excerpt also fails to teach any sort of configuration data store, as claimed by applicant, in view of the fact that such excerpt only generally teaches that user setup data is stored, but is silent as to where it is stored.

With respect to the subject matter of Claim 7 et al., presently incorporated into each of the independent claims, the Examiner has relied on paragraph [0048], lines 1-6 to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed technique "wherein said configuration data store is one of: a Windows Registry entry; an INI file; a DAPI store; and a database entry." In relying on such excerpt, it seems the Examiner has relied on Uszok's disclosure of an event registry utilized for publishing and subscribing to various events to meet applicant's specific claim language. Applicant respectfully asserts that the registry relied on by the Examiner in no way meets a configuration data store, let alone a configuration data store that "is one of: a Windows Registry entry; an INI file; a DAPI store; and a database entry."

- 14 -

With respect to the subject matter of Claim 8 et al., presently incorporated into each of the independent claims, the Examiner has relied on paragraph [0070], lines 10-22 to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed technique "wherein said identifier of a target process includes at least one of: data specifying a computer file operable to trigger said target process; data specifying a communication channel operable to trigger said target process; and data specifying an operating system command operable to trigger said target process." Applicant respectfully asserts that such excerpt merely relates to creating a botBox account, and therefore does not teach an "identifier of a target process [that] includes at least one of: data specifying a computer file operable to trigger said target process; data specifying a communication channel operable to trigger said target process; and data specifying an operating system command operable to trigger said target process" (emphasis added), as claimed.

Since the Uszok reference fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, as noted above, a notice of allowance or a proper prior art showing of all of applicant's claim limitations, in combination with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

Applicant further notes that the prior art is also deficient with respect to the dependent claims. Just by way of example, with respect to Claim 2 et al., the Examiner has relied on paragraph [0014], line 11 from Uszok to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed technique "wherein said operation specifying data is passed from said initiating computer to said target computer as XML data." Applicant respectfully asserts that such excerpt only teaches an mBot located on a client side that implements XML. Simply nowhere in such excerpt is there even a suggestion of any sort of "operation specifying data," let alone "operation specifying data [that] is passed from said initiating computer to said target computer as XML data," as claimed by applicant (emphasis added).

As another example, with respect to Claim 11 et al., the Examiner has relied on paragraph [0122], lines 1-2 from Uszok to make a prior art showing of applicant's

- 15 -

claimed technique “wherein said result data includes data specifying existing configuration data of said target computer.” Applicant respectfully asserts that such excerpt only teaches that a “user may choose to create...temporary profiles based on existing ones.” Clearly, a user creating profiles, as in Uszok, does not meet any sort of result data, as claimed by applicant. Furthermore, applicant asserts that existing user profiles, as in Uszok, also do not meet applicant’s claimed “existing configuration data of said target computer” (emphasis added).

Again, since the Uszok reference fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, as noted above, a notice of allowance or a proper prior art showing of all of applicant’s claim limitations, in combination with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

Still yet, applicant brings to the Examiner’s attention the subject matter of new Claims 52-54 below, which are added for full consideration:

“validating said operation specifying data received at said agent process against schema data, where said schema data is sent to said agent process from said initiating computer at the same time as said operation specifying data” (see Claim 52);

“validating said operation specifying data received at said agent process against schema data, where said schema data is present in said agent process when said operation specifying data is sent ” (see Claim 53); and

“parsing said operation specifying data after validating said operation specifying data to extract at least one identifier for mapping said at least one identifier to an available target process” (see Claim 54).

- 16 -

Thus, all of the independent claims are deemed allowable. Moreover, the remaining dependent claims are further deemed allowable, in view of their dependence on such independent claims.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P451/01.285.01).

Respectfully submitted,  
Zilka-Kotab, PC.

  
Kevin J. Zilka  
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120  
San Jose, CA 95172-1120  
408-505-5100